

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/23/07 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21, 22, 26, 27, 29, 30, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Hamlin in view of Moura.

Referring to claim 21, Adams discloses a system for redistributing a plurality of audio/video input signals to a plurality of communications interfaces over conductors, comprising:

a server (column 8, lines 24-25), the server controlling an output channel selection of the input signals responsive (column 8, lines 7-12; figure 4; figure 7, part 112) to one or more control signals input into the communications interface (figure 7, part 119), and at least one processor for processing the signals for switching (column 9, lines 59-62), and

at least one switching device for routing the channel selection in the format of an internet protocol (column 8, lines 7-12), the switching device being controlled by the server responsive to one or more control signals input into the communications interface (column 9, lines 66-67; column 10, lines 1-8) wherein the communications interface receives the channel selection for transmission to a receiving unit connected to the communications interface (column 10, lines 28-32).

Adams does not disclose a system with at least one demodulator for demodulating the input signals; and

wherein the communication interface is a plurality of communication interfaces; and output a single output signal to the one of plurality of communication interfaces.

Hamlin discloses a system with at least one demodulator for demodulating the input signals (figure 2).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the demodulator taught by Hamlin to the system disclosed by Adams.

The motivation would have been to allow multiple inputs to be distributed over a single bus (column 3, lines 25-28).

Adams and Hamlin do not disclose a system wherein the communication interface is a plurality of communication interfaces; and output a single output signal to the one of plurality of communication interfaces.

In an analogous art, Moura teaches a system wherein the communication interface is a plurality of communication interfaces; and output a single output signal to the one of plurality of communication interfaces (figure 1; column 5, lines 22-52).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the multiple communication interfaces taught by Moura to the system disclosed by Adams and Hamlin. The motivation would have been to enable the system to work with more communication networks making its possible customer base wider.

Claim 29 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 21.

Referring to claim 22, Adams does not disclose a system of claim 21 in which the input signals are in different signal formats.

Hamlin discloses a system of claim 21 in which the input signals are in different signal formats (figure 2).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the demodulator taught by Hamlin to the system disclosed by Adams. The motivation would have been to allow multiple inputs to be distributed over a single bus (column 3, lines 25-28).

Claim 30 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 22.

Referring to claim 26, Adams does not disclose a system of claim 21 in which the communications interface includes a data interface for receiving data from a keyboard, joystick, card reader, bar code reader, or other data-providing device.

Hamlin discloses a system of claim 21 in which the communications interface includes a data interface for receiving data from a keyboard, joystick, card reader, bar code reader, or other data providing device (column 6, lines 9-12).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the IR remote control taught by Hamlin to the system disclosed by Adams. The motivation would have been that IR communication is a common way of transmitting control signals.

Claim 34 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 26.

Referring to claim 27, Adams discloses a system of claim 21 in which the communications interface includes a network interface for transmitting data from a computer as an input signal to the demodulator (figure 5, part 76).

Claim 35 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 27.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin E. Shepard whose telephone number is (571) 272-5967. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JS

/Annan Q Shang/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2424